



3679
CPW

IN THE PATENT AND TM OFFICE

Appn. Number: 09/516,655

Filing Date: 03/01/00

Applicant: Thompson, Thomas C.

Appn. Title: Retrofit Hurricane-Earthquake Clip

Examiner: Garcia, Ernesto

Mailed July 21, 2005

AMENDMENT K

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed 07/13/05, I have included in this response the following:

1. Response and 19 amended claims (1-10 and 15-23), including 2 independent and 17 dependent, written to comply with current amendment practice as stated by the examiner.
2. Certificate of Mailing.

Very respectfully,


Thomas C. Thompson

Certificate of mailing:

I hereby certify that this correspondence, containing 7 pages including this cover page, is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents,
P. O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 2313-1450

on July 21, 2005
(Date)

Printed name of person signing this certificate:


Thomas C. Thompson

Signature: 

RESPONSE

1. **The reply filed on April 25, 2005 fails to comply with current amendment practice because of the following omissions or matters: Claim 1 fails to properly show all changes. The language “,unequal,” in line 10 of the amendment filed 10/20/03 as provided in the last notice of non-compliant amendment was either omitted or deleted. If the language was deleted applicant needs to show this change through strike-through according to 37 CFR 1.121. The acute-bends offset the blocking webs 2 and 3 away from the wall, and the unequal-bends form the blocking webs parallel to the blocking and frieze boards of a building. The unequal, acute bends are the unique and patentable part of the invention. The applicant has included “unequal” back in claim 1, but has not underlined it.**
2. **Further, the status identifier, “(Previously canceled)” in claims 11-14 is not a proper identifier under Rule 37 CFR 1.121. The proper identifier should be “(Canceled)”. The applicant has eliminated “previously”.**
3. **Further, the alphanumeric delineation in claim 1 is not placed in order. If item e is added, then it should follow item d as it is a well-known and common practice. The applicant has moved item e after item d, but has kept it underlined until it is entered.**
4. **Also, applicant should consider putting the claims in order such that claim 6 does not follow claim 8, but rather follows claim 5 in sequence. The applicant has moved claim 6.**
5. Accordingly, since the applicant perceives that the amended claims comply with current amendment practice, and read over the cited references, the applicant submits that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action applicant respectfully solicits. If the examiner agrees but does not feel that the present claims are technically adequate, applicant respectfully requests that the examiner write acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP 707.07(j).

Very Respectfully,



Thomas C. Thompson

92-543 Kokole Pl.

Makakilo, HI 96707

808 672-3107